Passive without passive morphology?
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1. Introduction

This paper deals with a passive like construction in Manggarai which appears to be typologically unusual because it has no specific verbal passive morphology on the verb. Rather than marking on the verb, the passive in Manggarai is marked on the Agent argument analytically, i.e. by means of the preposition le, which can get shortened as l=. This is illustrated by sentences in (1): sentence (1a) is a canonical sentence with the Agent coming before the verb and sentence (1b) is a pragmatically marked structure with the Agent being backgrounded coming after the verb and gets marked by l=.

1 We thank Bill Foley, Jane Simpson, Mark Donohue, Adrian Clynes, and Erik Zobel for their comments on the earlier version of this paper when it was presented at the 9ICAL, Canberra. Special thanks must go to Laurie Reid, who has read the paper thoroughly and given us detailed and useful comments. All errors are, however, ours.

2 Manggarai is a language belonging to the Central-Malayo Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian languages (Blust 1978), spoken by around 400.000 speakers in western and north central Flores (Indonesia). It has four main dialects (Verheijen, 1991:315: the dialects of East Manggarai, Central Manggarai, S>H Manggarai (named after the /s/ and /h/ correspondence, also called Rego), and West Manggarai. Unless otherwise stated the data reflect the dialect of Central Manggarai. The second author is a native speaker of Manggarai.

3 The preposition le may appear as l= and li (and sometimes ali). These allomorphs are partly phonologically and partly lexically determined. Le is used for common nouns and pronouns beginning with a consonant (e.g. le polisi ‘by the police’, le hau ‘by you’, le meu ‘by you). Clitic l= is used when the following noun begins with a vowel, e.g. l=aku ‘by me’, l=ami ‘by us (inclusive)’, l=iha ‘by him/her’. Li is used when the following noun object is a proper name (or kin terms used as such), e.g. li John ‘by John’, li kakak ‘by our/your elder brother/sister’. It should be noted that li= is replaced by le= in some dialects (e.g. in Rego).

4 The following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1,2,3 (First, Second and Third person), A (Actor), APPL (applicative), ART (article), ASP (aspect), AV (agentive voice), DET (determiner), GEN (genitive), IN (inchoative), IRR (irrealis), NOM (nominative), NUM (number), OV (objective voice), p (plural), subscript p (polite), P (patient), PASS (passive), PERS (person), POSS (possessive), R (realis), s (singular), S ((intransitive) subject).
(1)a.  
Aku cero latung=k
1s fry corn-1s
‘I fry/am frying corn’

b.  
Latung hitu cero l=aku=i
corn that fry by-1s=3s
‘The corn is (being) fried by me’

In this paper we argue that sentence (1b) is indeed syntactically passive. That is, (i) the patient latung, which was Object in (1a), is Subject in (1b); and (ii) the Agent aku marked by prepositional clitic l= in (1b) is syntactically a non-core argument. We will present the evidence shortly to prove the idea that sentence (1b) is an instance of passive despite the fact that the verb has the same form as that in (active) sentence (1a). We argue that the non-typical characteristics of the le passive in Manggarai are independently motivated by Manggarai’s language specific property as an isolating language.

The paper is organised as follows. First, basic surface clause structures in Manggarai will be presented in section 2, followed by a brief discussion on clitic sets in section 3. Evidence for passive constructions without passive morphology is given in section 4. A typological note of the analysis is discussed in section 5. Finally, the conclusion is given in section 6.

2. Basic clause structures

Morphologically, Manggarai is isolating (i.e. words in Manggarai are typically monomorphemic). Structurally, it is a head-initial language. Its clause structure, for example, is basically SVO, with the Subject argument also possibly coming after the verb (and the Object NP). The Subject (and in certain circumstances, Object, see examples (7)) can be expressed by an NP which is also cross-referenced by a pronominal enclitic that agrees with it. Pronominal clitic agreement associated with Subject is exemplified by aku and =k in (1a) and agreement associated with Object is later given in examples (7).

We will show later that an enclitic alone or an NP alone can function as Subject (or Object). When both the enclitic and the free NP are present, we argue that the enclitic is the ‘real’ Subject or Object. Unlike Subject and Object (which are core arguments), an Oblique can never be cross-referenced by a pronominal enclitic.

The following are some important features of Manggarai syntax.

---

5 It should be noted, however, that the Object in (1a) and the Subject in (1b) are not semantically the same: one is indefinite, the other definite. Sentence (1a) is a natural active sentence with an indefinite Object but it would be fine if the Object is definite. Strictly speaking, (1b) cannot therefore be a ‘true derivation’ of (1a). Indeed, there is evidence from western Austronesian languages that passive is not derived from active or vice versa; see footnote 36.

6 Following Kosmas (2000) and Semiun (1993), we analyse the preverbal NP as the grammatical Subject of the clause, which generally also functions as the default TOP. The evidence for this analysis highlighted in this paper comes from clitic agreement, control and relativisation.

7 That is, the enclitic is the argument that bears Subject or Object relation whereas the free NP may simply carry the pragmatic function of TOP and share the function of Subject/Object.
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First of all, the sentence initial free NP is in fact the default TOP(ic) and it is also by default the grammatical subject (henceforth, SUBJ) of the sentence (which is possibly clause external in an extended clause structure). The idea that it is the default TOP comes from the restriction that it must be definite. For example, omitting the article hi9 of hi enu ‘the girl’ from the SUBJ NP in sentence (2a) below gives rise to a bad sentence as shown by (2b):

(2a).  
\[ \text{Hi enu cebong sili tiwu lewe} \]
ART girl bath in pool long
‘The girl took a bath in the long pool’

b. *  
\[ \text{Enu cebong sili tiwu lewe} \]
girl bath in pool long
The TOP NP can be ‘cross-referenced’ by an enclitic pronoun. This is already exemplified by the transitive sentence in (1a), in which enclitic =k agrees with aku. More examples are given in (3), where the sentences are intransitive. In (3a), enclitic =i (third person singular) agrees with hia and in (3b) it agrees with hi Kode. In (3c), enclitic =s (third person plural) agrees with ise. In contrast to (3c), sentence (3d) is bad because agreement is violated (i.e. =i is incompatible with ise).

(3a).  
\[ \text{Hia pa’u eta mai bubung mbaru hitu=i} \]
3s fall above from top.roof house that=3s
‘(S)he fell down from the roof top of the house’

b.  
\[ \text{Hi Kode ka’eng wa tana=i} \]
ART monkey stay down ground=3s
‘The monkey lives on the ground’

c.  
\[ \text{Ise lonto musi mai ami=s} \]
3p sit behind from 1pi=3p
‘They sat/were sitting behind us’

d. *  
\[ \text{Ise lonto musi mai ami=i} \]
The enclitic pronoun may function as an anaphoric pronoun. The antecedent of the enclitic may be within the same (extended) clause. This type of anaphoric relation is exemplified by =i and =s in (3). However, the antecedent of the enclitic may be in a different clause or sentence preceding the clause containing the enclitic. Therefore, the enclitic in this context generally functions to maintain topic continuity in a stretch of sentences. For example, in the following quotation from a story, the enclitic =i in (4), which is the Subject in the first sentence and an Object in the second one, refers to a child (who gets lost in the jungle and becomes a sago tree), who has been mentioned in the preceding clause:

The determiner (e.g. hitu ‘that’) also has the same function as the article.

---

8 An ‘extended clause’ is a clause structure that includes an extra clausal NP in the TOP (adjoined) position; to be discussed shortly with reference to the tree diagram in (5) below.

9 The determiner (e.g. hitu ‘that’) also has the same function as the article.
Let us be specific about the structural position of the sentence initial NP that acts as the antecedent for the enclitic pronoun. It appears that it occupies a clause external position of TOP position within an extended clause structure (see Bresnan 2001:116). To illustrate the point, consider sentence (3a), which can be analysed as having the structure shown in (5). In this structure, the verb \textit{pa’u} and the following PP \textit{etamai bubung} are within VP; and then the VP and the enclitic \textit{=i} form the clause. (For simplicity, the internal structure of VP is not shown.) The clause is represented as IP, which represents a projection of the category I, where I is a functional category that carries Tense or Aspect information, i.e. traditionally the auxiliary. (IP corresponds to the traditional symbol S (=sentence)). The I category is not realised in this structure and is not shown in the tree. The (pronominal) clitic SUBJ is within the clause, represented as within the (lower) IP. The extended clause structure is represented as the higher IP, which includes a TOP position outside the lower IP. The TOP position is called an adjunction position (i.e. a position that is adjoined to IP to form another higher IP). The TOP NP and the SUBJ enclitic are co-indexed by a subscript \textit{i} to show that they must agree in their referential features (PERS and NUM), otherwise the structure is not acceptable (e.g. (3d)).

Supporting evidence for the analysis shown in (5), where the enclitic pronoun is SUBJ, comes from the structural properties of the enclitic. In particular, it can be attached to the final word of different kinds of syntactic units contained in the VP, that precede it within the clause. For example, it can be attached to the Object NP of a transitive verb as in (1a), to a PP agent as in (1b), and, if the verb is intransitive, to the last word of an Oblique/Adjunct PP as in (5).

In real texts, either the free NP TOP alone or the enclitic pronoun alone can appear as Subject. This gives the impression that either of them is optional. However, both of them cannot be absent in a given clause (unless the subject is controlled in an embedded clause). Hence, sentences (6a, b) are both fine, but sentence (6c) is not (as an independent clause). The fact that the two nominals which are involved in the agreement do not have to show up together at the same time suggests that

---

10 Words belonging to this I category include \textit{reme} ‘PROG’, \textit{paka} ‘must’ and \textit{kudut} ‘FUT’. These auxiliaries precede verbs in Manggarai.
the nature of the ‘agreement’ is not grammatical (i.e. it is not exactly like Subject-verb agreement in English).

However, in certain circumstances, the enclitic pronoun can function as an Object (but not an Oblique). Consider examples (7). Sentence (7a) is a simplified version of the second clause in (4), where \( =i \) is the patient Object of the verb \( \text{waeng} \). The enclitic \( (=i) \) cannot be understood to refer to Subject \( \text{ghau} \) ‘2s’ (because \( =i \) and \( \text{ghau} \) have different referential features). In (7b) enclitic \( =i \) is cross-referenced by the (Patient) NP \( \text{ata hitu} \) ‘that person’, which follows it. Note that the Patient NP cannot be extraposed sentence initially (i.e. unacceptability of (7c). The unacceptability of sentence (7c) suggests that the enclitic Object agreement is highly constrained: the enclitic that agrees with the sentence-initial TOP is restricted to the Subject function, i.e. it cannot be Object.

(6)a. \( \text{Hia ongga aku} \)
    3s    hit    1s

b. \( \text{Ongga aku-}\)
    hit    1s-3s

c.* \( \text{Ongga aku} \)

‘(S)he hit me’

(7)a. \( \text{Ghau peke waeng}=i \ldots \)  \( \text{(Rego)} \)
    2s    must    water=3s

‘You must water him …’

b. \( \text{Aku kawe}=i \text{ ata ghitu} \)
    1s    look.for=3s    person that

‘I’m looking for that person’

c.* \( \text{Ata ghitu Aku kawe}=i \)

Furthermore, it appears that the distribution of the enclitic pronoun functioning as Object is also constrained by the PERS category of the Object. For example, the first and second person Object enclitics are not possible as illustrated by the contrast in (8). Sentence (8a) is bad because the Patient Object is \( =k \), the first person pronominal clitic. To make this sentence acceptable, a free (i.e. non-clitic) pronoun \( \text{aku} \) must be used (8b).

(8)a.* \( \text{Ghia ongga}=k \)  \( \text{(Rego)} \)
    3s    hit=1s

‘(S)he hit me’

\[ \text{11} \]  The exact condition of the distribution of the enclitic pronoun that may function as Object needs further studies. At this stage, bearing in mind that there are restrictions of the distribution of the Object enclitic agreement, it is enough to point out that pronominal enclitic agreement is a property of Core in Manggarai because a non-core argument never gets this property. That is, while the relation between the clitic and its antecedent is anaphoric in nature (i.e. not syntactic), the distribution of the clitic itself is syntactically constrained because it must be a core argument.
b.  
\begin{align*}
\text{Ghia} & \quad \text{ongga} \quad \text{aku} \\
3s & \quad \text{hit} \quad 1s \\
\text{‘(S)he hit me’}
\end{align*}

While subject and object arguments in Manggarai can get expressed as enclitics and/or receive enclitic agreement, Oblique arguments cannot. Thus, in contrast to (9a) where the Goal Oblique is expressed by \textit{hia} (a free pronoun), sentence (9b) is bad because the Oblique is expressed by the corresponding clitic form, \(=i\). The contrast in (9c-d) further shows that an Oblique argument cannot receive enclitic agreement.

(9)a.  
\begin{align*}
\text{Aku} & \quad \text{tombo} \quad \text{agu} \quad \text{hia} \\
1s & \quad \text{talk} \quad \text{with} \quad 3s \\
\text{‘I talked with him/her’}
\end{align*}

b.  * \begin{align*}
\text{Aku} & \quad \text{tombo} \quad \text{agu}=i \\
\end{align*}

c.  \begin{align*}
\text{Aku} & \quad \text{tombo} \quad \text{agu} \quad \text{hi} \quad \text{Joni} \\
1s & \quad \text{talk} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{ART name} \\
\text{‘I talked with Joni’}
\end{align*}

d.  * \begin{align*}
\text{Aku} & \quad \text{tombo} \quad \text{agu}=i \quad \text{hi} \quad \text{Joni}
\end{align*}

To conclude, enclitic agreement is a property of Core (i.e. Subject and Object) arguments in Manggarai (bearing in mind that an Object may have certain restrictions). Obliques do not share this property.

3. *(En)clitic sets in Manggarai*

There are three sets of clitics in Manggarai that are of interest. They are shown in Table 1: pronominal SUBJ/OBJ (or Core) enclitics (column 3), pronominal GENitive enclitics (column 4), and POSSessive \(d(e)\) clitics (column 5). For simplicity, only the GEN and POSS clitics are discussed in this subsection.

The pronominal GEN set is inflected for PERS and NUM whereas the POSS clitic set is not. The POSS clitic set may appear, however, as either syllabic \(de\) or non-syllabic (i.e. only consonant) \(d=\).12 Both GEN and POSS clitic sets are used to express possession and nominalisation. Nominalisation examples are given in (11)-(12) below.

---

12 We do not label the \(d(e)\) clitic as Genitive to underline the fact that the clitic itself is not infected and is formally distinct from the pronominal (inflected) GEN clitic. It is not clear at this stage whether historically \(d(e)\) is a Locative marker corresponding to \textit{di} found in other Austronesian languages of Indonesia. A locative in contemporary Manggarai is expressed by an unrelated prepositional form, \textit{one}. For this reason, \(d(e)=\) is labelled as POSS rather than Locative even though we do not exclude the possibility that the possessive meaning might be historically from the locative meaning (e.g. ‘something is with/in/at me’). (This point was raised to us by Laurie Reid.)

13 In other dialects such as Kempo, \(d=\) becomes \(g=\) in some members of the set. This seems to be phonologically motivated by the (following) velar consonant of the pronoun. In Kempo, we have \(g=aku \ ‘1s.GEN’\), \(g=au \ ‘2s.GEN’\), \(g=ami \ ‘1p.e.GEN’\), \(g=emî \ ‘2p.GEN’\).
Table 1: Clitic sets in Manggarai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FREE</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>POSS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s.</td>
<td>Aku</td>
<td>=k</td>
<td>=g</td>
<td>d=aku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s.</td>
<td>hau</td>
<td>=h</td>
<td>=m</td>
<td>de=hau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s.</td>
<td>hia</td>
<td>=i</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>d=aha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.e</td>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>=km</td>
<td>=gm</td>
<td>d=ami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.i</td>
<td>Ite</td>
<td>=t</td>
<td>=d</td>
<td>d=ite (plural polite form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>Meu</td>
<td>=m</td>
<td>=s</td>
<td>de=meu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>Ise</td>
<td>=s</td>
<td>=d</td>
<td>d=ise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another difference between the two sets is illustrated in (10). The pronominal GEN enclitic is attached to the possessed noun whereas the POSS d(e) clitic is generally attached to the pronominal possessor. The pairs in (10) illustrate alternative ways of expressing possession in Manggarai.

(10) a. buku=k buku d=aku
      book=1s.GEN book POSS =1s ‘my book’

b. buku=m buku de=hau
      book=2s.GEN book POSS=2s ‘your(s.) book’

c. buku=t buku d=ite
      book=1pi.GEN book POSS =1pi ‘our book’

d. buku=s buku de=meu

Examples (11)–(14) show that the POSS and GEN sets are used in nominalisation. The crucial point to note is that, using Dixon’s/Comrie’s terminology (Comrie 1978; Dixon 1979; Dixon 1994), they can be associated with S (the sole core argument of the intransitive verb), A and P (Actor and Patient core arguments of the transitive verb). Examples (11) show that POSS de=NPs are associated with S whereas the ones in (12) show they are associated with A (12a) and P (12b).

(11) a. Mata de keraeng tu’a
    die POSS master old
    ‘the death of the older brother/sister’

    b. Mai de dokter hitu
    come POSS doctor that
    ‘The coming/arrival of the doctor’

14 In the Kempo dialect, the pronominal enclitics functioning as SUBJ enclitics and GEN enclitics are not distinguishable, see Semiun (1993).

15 The fact that the enclitics in Manggarai can be associated with the three core arguments (S, A and P) suggest that morphologically speaking nominalisation does not provides evidence for accusative or ergative system alignment.
(12) a. Weli de ende  
    buy POSS mother  
    ‘The buying (of/ by) Mother’

b. Pika=d kaba situ  
    sell=POSS buffalo that  
    ‘The selling of the buffalo’

Pronominal GEN clitics can also be associated with S as in (13a), P as in (13b), and A as in (14). There are two things to be noted here. First, the GEN enclitic must agree with the following nominal, e.g. the unacceptability of (13c) in contrast to (13a) because the third person singular clitic =n does not agree with the plural NP ata situ. Second, the property of the bound pronominal as a clitic is evident from the fact that its distribution is not constrained by the grammatical category of the host (Zwicky 1985, 1987; Zwicky and Pullum 1983). For instance, in (14a), it appears attached to the head verb whereas in (14b) it is cliticised to the Patient NP (of the VP).

(13) a. Lako=n ata hitu  
    go=3s.GEN person that.s  
    ‘The leaving of the person’

b. Weli=n mbaru hitu  
    buy=3s.GEN house that  
    ‘The buying of the house’

c. * Lako=n ata situ  
    go=3s.GEN person that.p  
    ‘The leaving of the persons’

(14) a. Akit=n acu hitu dilem-dilem=n Kempo  
    bit-3s.GEN dog that.s deep-deep=3s  
    (Semiu 1993: 77)  
    ‘the dog’s bite is very deep’

b. Akit indus=n acu hitu dilem-dilem=n  
    bit cat-3s.GEN dog that.s deep-deep=3s  
    ‘the dog’s bite on the cat is very deep’

To conclude, Manggarai is poor in verbal morphology and makes use of clitics to show alternative syntactic expressions of the argument (S, A or P) of the verb.

4. The passive le

There is evidence that the le construction that gives rise to a backgrounding effect is syntactically passive. That is, we argue that the alternation shown in (1), repeated as (15), involves (a) syntactic demotion of the Agent to non-core status and (b) syntactic promotion of the Patient to Subject status.
In what follows, we present evidence that the *le* Agent is not Subject. There is convincing evidence that it is an Oblique.

4.1 The Agent marked by *le* is not Subject

First, evidence for the idea that the *le* Agent is not Subject comes from enclitic agreement. Recall that TOP-Subject can have pronominal agreement. In (15a), *aku* is TOP and the real subject is the enclitic =*k*. In (15b), there is a change in agreement triggered by the promotion/foregrounding of the Patient NP *latung hitu*: this NP now agrees with the enclitic =*i*. This is what is expected on the analysis that sentence (15b) is a passive structure. That is, the Patient is indeed grammatically Subject of this sentence and the *le* agent is not Subject. Then, we expect that the *le* Agent can no longer have clitic agreement. This is confirmed as shown by the unacceptability of (16a, b):

(16) a.  *Latung hitu cero l=aku* (cf. (15b))

b.  *Latung hitu cero l=aku=*

Second, further evidence comes from structural positions. Given the analysis that the *le* Agent has non-core status, it is expected that it is adjunct-like and is therefore more mobile than the NP agent. We expect that it may appear in several positions. This is confirmed. For example, the *le* Agent can appear after the subject enclitic as in (17a), after a sentence adverbial like *meseng* ‘yesterday’ as in (17b), or it can even appear before the subject enclitic as already observed in (1b, 15b), repeated here again for comparison as (17c).

(17) a.  *Kala situ toto=s l=ise*
    betel.nuts that.p show=3p by=3p
    ‘The betel nuts were shown by them’

b.  *Latung hitu cero meseng l=aku*
    corn that fry yesterday by-1s
    ‘The corn was fried by me yesterday’

c.  *Latung hitu cero l=aku=i* (=1b/15b))
    corn that fry by-1s=3s
    ‘The corn is (being) fried by me’

In contrast, the distribution of the Agent NP is less restricted than the distribution of the *le* Agent. The Agent NP typically appears sentence-initially before a verb phrase (VP) or sentence finally after a VP. Crucially, it cannot come within a VP (i.e. it cannot intervene between verb and
its Patient object NP). Thus, the following contrast is expected in the present analysis where the le Agent is not Subject:

(18) a. \( \text{Cero le=aku latung hitu} \) V – PP(Oblique) – NP(Subject)
\( \begin{array}{l}
1s \quad \text{fry} \quad \text{corn that} \\
\quad \text{‘I fried the corn’}
\end{array} \)

b. * \( \text{Cero aku latung hitu} \) V – NP(Subject) – NP (Object)
\( \begin{array}{l}
\text{fry} \quad 1s \quad \text{corn that} \\
\quad \text{‘I fried the corn’}
\end{array} \)

Sentence (18a) (acceptable) is a passive structure with the Patient coming sentence finally as the Subject while the Oblique le Agent appears (possibly inside the VP) before the Patient NP. In contrast, structure (18b) is not allowed in Manggarai because it would be interpreted as an active structure with its Agent (Subject) NP intervening in the VP sequence (i.e. between the verb and the Patient Object).

Note that our analysis of Manggarai clause structures claims: i) that the Agent NP and the le Agent PP are syntactically different arguments (i.e. the TOP/Subject NP vs the Agent Oblique PP) and ii) structurally they occupy different positions. Further evidence to support these claims comes from the contrast shown in (19). Sentence (19b) is bad because the le Agent (\( \text{l=ise} \)), which is an Oblique, is forced to appear in the (default) TOP/SUBJ position before the verb.

(19) a. \( \text{l=ise ongga ata hitu} \) 3p hit person that.s
\( \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{‘They hit the person’}
\end{array} \)

b. * \( \text{l=ise ongga ata hitu} \) by=3p hit person that.s

Third, the le construction appears to be motivated by the same (syntactic) reason that drives a passive structure in other languages, namely the need for the Patient to be linked to Subject to meet certain syntactic requirement such as control, in which case the Agent is then forced to be demoted or backgrounded. Manggarai is like some other western Austronesian languages in preferring Subject to be controlled. Constructions that involve control are, among others, purposive clauses, participial clauses and relative clauses. In what follows, we exemplify each of these clause types in turn.

Consider the purposive clauses (marked by te) in (20). (The controlled or gapped argument position is indicated by a dash.) The purposive clause in (20a) is intransitive with its sole argument controlled and gapped. The one in (20b) is (active) transitive with its Agent being the Subject

16 However, sentence (19b) can be made acceptable by nominalising the head verb as in shown below:

\( \text{l=ise ongga-n ata hitu} \)
\( \begin{array}{l}
by=3p \quad \text{hit-GEN3s} \quad \text{person that.s} \\
\quad \text{‘They hit the person’ (Lit. ‘the hitting of the person was by me’)}
\end{array} \)

This sentence is quite different from sentence (19b). It is not a passive counterpart of (19a), rather it is the one where the preposition (le) acts as the head predicate and the nominalised verb acts as the Subject argument of the predicate. We will not discuss the issue of nominalisation in this paper any further.
argument. Control is fine. Sentence (20c) shows a failed attempt to control the Patient argument because the Patient is the Object argument of the purposive clause. Finally, sentence (20d) shows the acceptable version of (20c) where a passive structure is used allowing the Patient argument to be expressed as the grammatical Subject. Note that the Agent of this purposive clause must appear in its Oblique function, marked by le.

(20) Controlled clauses: purposive clauses:

a. Ame mo one lo’ang [te __ toko] Kempo
   father go loc bedroom te sleep (Semiun 1993: 93)
   ‘Father went into the bedroom to sleep’

b. Ame mo le uma [te __ weri mawo]
   father go to garden te plant rice
   ‘Father went to the garden to plant rice’

c. * Ame mo wa kota [te dokter priksa ___ ]
   father go Loc town te doctor examine
   ‘Father goes to town to be examined by (the/a) doctor’

d. Ame mo wa kota [te __ priksa le dokter]
   father go Loc town te examine by doctor
   ‘Father goes to town to be examined by the doctor’

Participial adjuncts involving control are exemplified in (21). Sentence (21a) (acceptable) shows that the Agent of an active participial adjunct is controlled. Sentence (21b) (unacceptable) shows an attempt to control the Patient of an active participial adjunct (i.e. object controlled). In

17 Unlike the purposive clauses, the participial adjuncts involving intransitive verbs have no ‘clear’ control structure as shown by the unacceptability of sentence (a) below. Instead, intransitive verbs are obligatorily nominalised; both GEN structures are possible as shown by (b) and (c).

a.* Aku porong hia lako
   1s see 3s walk
   ‘I saw him walking’

b. Aku porong lako d=iha
   1s see walk GEN=3s
   ‘I saw him walking’ (Lit. ‘I saw his walking)

c. Aku porong lako=n
   1s see walk=GEN.3s
   ‘I saw him walking’ (Lit. ‘I saw his walking)

The difference between participial adjuncts and purposive clauses with respect to intransitive verbs is perhaps due to the marking. Purposive clauses have a special marking to show subordination namely te, whereas participial clauses have no such special marking. Manggarai, then, extends GEN marking for this purpose. However, it is still not clear why ‘a gap’ strategy in the subject position is ruled out because a transitive verb allows this strategy as shown in (21a). (Other western Austronesian languages such as Indonesian and Balinese allow both gapping and nominalisation strategies.) It should be noted that the GEN strategy is also possible for a participial adjunct with a transitive verb as shown by the following example:

d. Aku ita tengo acu-e d=ia
   1s see hit dog-? GEN=3s
   (Kempo, Semiun (1993), ex. 252)
   ‘I saw him hitting the dog’
   (Lit. ‘I saw his hitting (of) the dog’)

11
order to have an acceptable version of (21b) where the Patient is controlled, the Patient must be linked to Subject and the Agent is demoted and backgrounded to Oblique as shown in (21c). This is just like the purposive clause exemplified in (20c-d), where the passive structure must be used.

(21) Controlled clauses: participial adjunct:

a. \( Aku \ ita \ hia \ [\ _\ emi \ seng \ hitu] \) \quad (A is controlled)
   1s see 3s take money that.3s \quad (active participial)
   ‘I saw him taking the money’

b. \* \( Aku \ ita \ hia \ [polisi \ deko \ _\] \) \quad (P is controlled, Active participle)
   1s see 3s police arrest
   ‘I saw him arrested by the police’

c. \( Aku \ ita \ hia \ [\ _\ deko \ le \ polisi] \) \quad (P is controlled)
   1s see 3s arrest by police \quad (passive participial)
   ‘I saw him arrested by the police’

The same restriction with respect to control is also observed in relativisation. The relative markers differ depending on the dialects, e.g. \( se \) (Rego) and \( ca \) (Kempo). The following examples (from Rego) show that non-subject arguments cannot be controlled:

(22) a \( Ata \ molah \ [se \ _\ ita \ aku] \ ghitu \ reba\ o \ ngo \ gi \) \quad (Rego)
   person girl REL see 1s that just.now go already
   ‘The girl [who saw me] has just gone’

b. \* \( Ata \ molah \ [se \ aku \ ita \ _\] \ ghitu \ reba\ o \ ngo \ gi \)
   person girl REL 1s see that just.now go already
   ‘The girl [that I saw] has just gone’

c. \( Ata \ molah \ [se \ _\ ita \ l=aku] \ ghitu \ reba\ o \ ngo \ gi \)
   person girl REL see by=1s that just.now go already
   ‘The girl [that I saw or that was seen by me] has just gone’

d. \* \( Ata \ molah \ [se \ aku \ ita \ le \ _\] \ ghitu \ reba\ o \ ngo \ gi \)
   person girl REL 1s see by that just.now go already
   ‘The girl [that saw me] has just gone’

Relativisation of the Agent argument of the active structure is fine (22a). No change in syntax of the embedded clause is observed (except the gapping of the Agent subject position). Again, an attempt to relativise/control the Patient Object gives rise to a bad sentence (22b). To enable the Patient to be relativised, it should be linked to Subject, which triggers a passive structure, in which case the Agent is expressed as an Oblique (22c). Relativisation of an Oblique also leads to a bad sentence as exemplified by (22d).

Relative clause structures are also used to express contrastive FOC, in which case the same constraint applies. For example, when the patient argument is given constrastive FOC, a passive structure is used as shown in (23b).
(23) a.  \textit{Joni ca [__ tengo acu]} \quad \text{(Kempo)}  \\
\text{name REL hit dog} \quad \text{Semiun (1993, ex. 278)}  \\
\text{‘It is John who hit the dog’}  \\
\text{‘John is the one who hit the dog’}  \\
\text{b.  \textit{Joni ca [__ tengo le\textsuperscript{18} polisi]} \quad \text{(Kempo)}  \\
\text{name REL hit by/of police} \quad \text{Semiun (1993, exx. 279, 280)}  \\
\text{‘It is John who was hit by the police’}  \\

The evidence presented so far indicates that the PP Agent (marked by \textit{le}) is not syntactically Subject. Let us now turn to evidence from reflexive binding, optionality, and grammatical encoding which suggests that the PP (\textit{le} Agent) is indeed an Oblique.

4.2 The Agent marked by \textit{le} is an Oblique argument

Evidence from reflexive binding strongly indicates that the \textit{le} Agent has non-Core status. Reflexive binding in Manggarai is sensitive to a grammatical relations hierarchy. One such hierarchy (observed across languages and also relevant in Manggarai) is the Subject>Object >Oblique hierarchy (Bresnan 2001; Keenan and Comrie 1977, among others), where notation ‘>’ means ‘… more prominent than…’. The evidence comes from the following examples:

(24) a.  \textit{Hia\textsubscript{i} mbele weki ru-n\textsubscript{i}} <\textit{hia\textsubscript{i}}, self\textsubscript{i}> \quad \text{(active)}  \\
3s kill body self-3s.GEN Subj. Obj.  \\
\text{‘S/he killed himself/herself’}  \\

b.  \textit{Hia\textsubscript{i} mbele le ru-n\textsubscript{i}} <<\textit{hia\textsubscript{i}}><\textit{self\textsubscript{i}}>> \quad \text{(passive)}  \\
3s kill by self-3s.GEN Subj. Obl.  \\
\text{‘S/he was killed by himself/herself’}  \\

In the active structure (24a), the reflexive (\textit{weki} \textit{run}) is thematically Patient and syntactically Object. Since it is Object, it is grammatically outranked by \textit{hia} (Subject). Binding of Object \textit{run} by Subject \textit{hia} is therefore fine. In (24b), the syntactic ranking of the Agent and Patient is reversed: the Patient is syntactically Subject (the highest ranked syntactic function) whereas the Agent now gets marked by \textit{le}. The evidence of the reversal of ranking comes from the fact the Patient of the passive construction in (24b) (i.e. \textit{hia}) can bind the \textit{le} Agent (\textit{le \textit{run}}). That is, the

\textsuperscript{18} The POSS marker \textit{de} can be also used here instead of \textit{le}. According to Semiun (1993:83) the difference between \textit{le} and \textit{de} is the semantics of the verb: \textit{le} implies an action-like situation, whereas \textit{de} implies a state-like situation.

\textsuperscript{19} However, a close look at argument structures across languages, the following ranking is also attested: (a) Core Arguments outrank Non-core arguments, (b) within sets of cores/non-cores, prominence reflects semantic prominence (see (Arka 1998; Manning 1996a, 1996b; Wechsler and Arka 1998)).
Agent reflexive run marked by le must be grammatically outranked by (i.e. lower than) the Patient hia/wekin, otherwise binding would not be possible. We take this evidence of successful binding of the le Agent by sentence-initial Patient hia to suggest that sentence (24b) is indeed a passive sentence where the le Agent is an Oblique.

Now, if the Subject argument of the passive structure is reflexive, then there should be a problem of binding of the reflexive from the le Agent. This is because the reflexive would syntactically outrank its intended binder. We expect binding to fail. The expectation is borne out. Consider (25) below. The intended binding (i.e. reading (ii)) fails. The sentence is acceptable only in its first reading, where the Agent must be someone else. In reading (i), the reflexive form only encodes emphasis (i.e. an emphatic reading). In short, the failure of binding shown by reading (ii) is what is expected on the passive analysis of the le agent.

\[(25)\quad \text{Weki} \quad \text{ru-n}_i \quad \text{mbele} \quad \text{le} \quad \text{hia}^{v_j} \quad \langle<\text{self}_i><\text{hia}_j^{n_j}>\rangle \quad \text{(passive)}\]
\[\text{body self-3s.GEN kill by 3s.}\]
\[\text{(i) ‘(S)he}_i \text{ (himself/ herself) was killed by him}_j/\text{her}_j’;\]
\[\text{(ii) ‘(S)he was killed by himself/herself’} \]

Further evidence from reflexive binding is illustrated by the active-passive alternation in examples (26)-(27). In (26a), the reflexive wekin precedes the Goal Oblique hi ase ‘little sibling’ (marked by kamping), whereas in (26b) it follows the Oblique. Notice that in both cases wekin can only be bound by Subject hi ema ‘father’ (index i), not by Oblique kamping hi ase (index j). This suggests that linear precedence does not play any role in reflexive binding in Manggarai. What matters is syntactic prominence: the binder must be syntactically more prominent than its bindee. Thus, we expect that if the Goal hi ase is linked to the grammatical subject by means of passivisation then binding is possible. This is indeed the case, as shown by (27), in which case the goal hi ase is the only possible binder of reflexive wekin. The fact that the passive Agent (i.e. PP Agent li ema) now fails to bind the theme wekin suggests that the Agent is now an Oblique. That is, if the le Agent were a Core argument (i.e. not Oblique) it would be able to bind the (Object/theme) reflexive wekin. Note that, as (27a) shows, when the Agent and the Theme are both core arguments, the Agent is a possible binder because it is thematically higher than the Theme/Patient (cf. Manning 1996a, 1996b).

\[(26)\]
\[\text{a. } \text{Hi} \quad \text{ema}_i \quad \text{toto} \quad \text{weki-n}_i \quad \text{one} \quad \text{kaca} \quad \text{kamping} \quad \text{hi} \quad \text{ase}^{v_j} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{father} \quad \text{show} \quad \text{refl-3} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{mirror} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{little.sibling}\]
\[\text{b. } \text{Hi} \quad \text{ema}_i \quad \text{toto} \quad \text{kamping} \quad \text{hi} \quad \text{ase}^{v_j} \quad \text{weki-n}_i \quad \text{one} \quad \text{kaca} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{father} \quad \text{show} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{little.sibling} \quad \text{refl-3} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{mirror}\]

‘Father showed himself in the mirror to (the/my) little sibling’

\[(27)\quad \text{Hi} \quad \text{ase}^{v_j} \quad \text{toto} \quad \text{weki-n}_i \quad \text{li} \quad \text{ema}^{v_j} \quad \text{one} \quad \text{kaca} \quad \text{ART} \quad \text{little.sibling} \quad \text{show} \quad \text{refl-3} \quad \text{by} \quad \text{father} \quad \text{at} \quad \text{mirror}\]

‘The/my little sibling was shown himself by Father in the mirror’

However, one might reject the passive analysis on the ground that the le Agent Oblique in many cases appears to be obligatory. This is unusual on the passive analysis since a passive Agent in other languages is generally optional. One would take it as evidence that the le Agent could be a Core argument rather than an Oblique.
We argue that such an analysis is untenable for the following reasons. First, in theory, there is no reason why an Oblique should be always optional. Certain Obliques may be obligatory for various reasons. For example, the locative Oblique of the verb *put* in English is obligatory. This is a lexically-specific constraint of the verb *put*.

Second, our study reveals that the requirement that in Manggarai the Oblique Agent be obligatorily present in Manggarai is due to an independent, language-specific constraint associated with grammatical relation marking of this language. In other languages, where passivisation is marked morphologically on the verb, the Agent oblique is indeed generally optional because verbal morphology has done the job of marking the passive structure. In contrast, in isolating languages like Manggarai, there is no such verbal marking strategy. Simply reversing the word order would result in confusion of the linking (Agent vs Patient). Prepositional marking with *le* is the only means to encode the passive structure. Since it is the only marker, it is understandably obligatory; otherwise no passive structure would be recognised.

Third, related to the second point just mentioned, we expect that, when the verb has received certain marking to encode a passive structure, which is by means of cliticisation in Manggarai, the *le* agent is optional. This is confirmed. Consider (28):

(28) a. \(\text{Poli=s} \quad \text{emi=d} \quad (l=\text{ise}) \quad \text{bao} \quad \text{surak} \quad \text{situ}\)
   \(\text{already=3p} \quad \text{take=POSS} \quad \text{by=3p} \quad \text{just.now} \quad \text{letter} \quad \text{that.p}\)
   ‘The letters have been taken (by them) (just now)’
   (Lit. The letters were already, the taking (of them) just now (by them)’

b. \(\text{Nia=s} \quad \text{na’a=d} \quad \text{bao} \quad \text{surak} \quad \text{situ} \quad (\text{le hau})\)
   \(\text{where=3p} \quad \text{place=POSS} \quad \text{just.now} \quad \text{letter} \quad \text{that.p} \quad \text{(by 2s)}\)
   ‘Where were the letters placed just now (by you)?
   ‘Lit. Where were they, the placing of the letters just now (by you)?’

c. \(\text{Toem} \quad \text{tiba=n} \quad \text{tegi} \quad d=\text{ite} \quad (l=\text{ise})\)
   \(\text{not.exist} \quad \text{accept-3GEN} \quad \text{demand} \quad \text{POSS=1p.i} \quad \text{by=3p}\)
   ‘Our demand was not accepted (by them)’
   (Lit. The acceptance of our demand (by them) did not exist’

In (28a) and (28b), the verbs (*emi, na’a*) are nominalised by the POSS marker \(=d\). The head predicates of these sentences are *poli* and *nia* which get the subject enclitics \(=s\) agreeing with the grammatical subject *surak situ*. Crucially, the demoted Agent is not obligatorily present. (This is indicated by putting the Agent within brackets.) If it is present, it is marked by the Oblique marker \(l(e)\). In (28c), the verb is nominalised by the inflected pronoun \(=n\), and again the Agent—which must be marked by \(l=\) (if present)— is optional.

Fourth, although uncommon, Agentless passive structures are indeed attested in texts. This kind of passive is typically used when the Patient (of a semantically transitive verb) is maintained as the topic along a stretch of clauses. The agent is either well understood from the context or is deleted because it is clear or considered unimportant in a given context. Consider the underlined clause in the following quotation:

---

20 As concluded by Verheijen (1977), on the basis of his 30,000 native words known in Manggarai, there is evidence from an historical point of view that Manggarai has never known affixation.
‘Arriving in the forest, he saw the rice basket of his child (still) hanging on a tip of a branch (of a tree) (Lit. ‘(he) arrived in the forest, (and) the rice basket of his child which was still being hung on a tip of a tree was seen by him’)

In this example, the semantically transitive verb weo ‘hang’ is used intransitively, i.e. it is used in a passive structure without an Agent. Recall that only Subject can be relativised in Manggarai. This excludes the analysis that the relativised Patient of the verb weo is Object. In other words, the underlined relative clause cannot be understood as an active clause with its Agent Subject missing, rather as a passive clause with its Subject Patient controlled and its Agent unexpressed.

Finally, the idea that the le agent is an Oblique gets support from its grammatical category expression. That is, Obliques in Manggarai are always marked by prepositions. Core arguments (i.e. Subject and Object) are always bare NPs, not marked by a preposition. The contrast in (30) shows that a Goal/Locative Oblique must be PP (30a), otherwise the sentence is not acceptable (30b). Then, when the Goal/Locative argument is promoted to Subject (31a), in which case it is a Core argument, the promotion to Core status necessarily requires a change in marking. That is, the Goal argument must be NP; otherwise the structure is bad (31b). Also, in this passive construction, the passive Agent must be PP because it is an Oblique; it cannot be NP (i.e. the unacceptability of (31c)).

In short, the basic function of the prepositions, e.g. le (marking the Agent), ngger one ‘into’ (marking Goal)—is to mark non-core status. Core arguments do not get preposition marking.
Therefore, we rule out the analysis which treats the PP (le) Agent as a Core argument. The le Agent should be analysed as an Oblique.

Finally, the claim regarding le as a passive marker should be slightly modified. This claim needs to be revised given the fact that Manggari le is not uniquely associated with the passive construction. For example, le is also the preposition used to mark locative as in le puar ‘in the forest’, goal as in le pasar ‘to the market’, instrument as in le wase nol ‘with a (piece of) rope (called) nol’. Thus, a better or more correct claim is to say that le is simply an Oblique marker.

To summarise, there is evidence to support the following ideas. First, backrounding/demotion of the Agent argument is also accompanied by foregrounding/promotion of the Patient argument. Second, the backgrounded le Agent is not Subject and the foregrounded Patient is Subject. Evidence comes from agreement (examples (15)-(16), structural positions (17)-(19), and control (20)-(23). Third, the backgrounded le Agent should be analysed as an Oblique argument for the following reasons:

- The le Agent, unlike the bare Agent NP, may appear in different positions (examples (17)-(19). This suggests that a PP Agent is structurally an Adjunct-like unit, hence a non-core or Oblique, because Subject (or a core argument) has a fixed position.
- The le Agent cannot bind a core Theme/Patient reflexive argument, which it thematically outranks (examples (24b) and (27)). This is not expected on the analysis that the le Agent is a core argument because if the Agent and the Theme/Patient are both core arguments, the Agent must be able to bind the Theme.
- The le Agent may be optional or unexpressed in certain circumstances (example (28)).
- In Manggarai, le is a preposition marking an OBL/ADJUNCT; a core argument is never realised by a PP in this language (cf. examples. (30)-31)).

5. Discussion

Typologically speaking, passive is a category of voice that is generally associated with verbal forms having certain passive morphology. That is, a particular affix on the verb is identified as a passive morpheme. Let us call this type of passives as the ‘morphological’ passive. Haspelmath (1990) adopts a strong view claiming that the verbal morphology associated with the passive construction is an essential part of the passive. He claims that ‘passive constructions without passive morphology do not exist’ (p.27). (In his view, other morphological devices used in passive constructions such as (prepositional) agent markers which are not specific to passive constructions are not considered ‘passive morphology’. We shall see below that Manggarai poses a challenge to his view.) He adopts the following definition of passive constructions:

(32) A construction is called passive if:

i. the active subject corresponds either to a non-obligatory oblique phrase or to nothing; and

ii. the active direct object (if any) corresponds to the subject of the passive; and

---

21 Le has been so far roughly glossed with ‘by’ for ease of the exposition of passives. It should perhaps be better glossed as either OBL (for Oblique), Pcase (i.e. prepositional case (marker)), or simply LE (i.e. as a marker). This avoids the necessity of determining what its exact case marking function is, or what its word class is, matters which are crucial to a full accounting of the syntax of the language. The fact that it can alternate with de in some contexts is an interesting case that deserves further studies.
iii. the construction is somehow restricted vis-à-vis another unrestricted construction (the active), e.g. less frequent, functionally specialised, not fully productive.

Based on a genetically stratified sample of 80 languages (the Gramcats sample), only 31 were found to have a passive. He notes that there are at least six expression types of morphological passives, as shown by Table 2. Among them, the ‘stem affix’ passive, i.e. the passive with its passive affix being attached directly to the verb stem, inside inflectional affixes (i.e. aspect, tense, and person markers), is by far the most common type. The English type where the passive is expressed by an auxiliary plus a participle verb is not a typical one.

Table 2 Expression types of passive morphemes in the Gramcats sample (Haspelmath 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression types</th>
<th>Number of languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional stem affix</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliary verb (+participle)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extrinflectional affix</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential subject person markers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternate stem affix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will not discuss and exemplify each of the types in this paper. Rather, we want to discuss the typology of passives in relation to the Manggarai data, taking into account Haspelmath’s claim that there is no such thing as ‘passives without passive morphology’ because, according to him, the passive is essentially a verbal morphological category (diachronically) motivated by ‘inactivation’ of the verbal situation. He further claims that inactivisation is the original function of the passive, not the participant backgrounding or foregrounding. (The latter is a consequence of inactivisation.) The evidence for this, according to him, comes from the grammaticisation path, where the case of inactive auxiliaries is probably the most common source of passive morphology across languages (for example, just to mention some languages outside Austronesian languages here, Korean passive affix -ji (from (<) the verb ji- ‘fall’), Tamil –pat (< the verb patu ‘fall, happen’), Equadorian Quechua –ri (< the verb ri- ‘go’), Turkic –il/-îl (< the verb ol- ‘be’), and Japanese –ar(e) (< the verb aru ‘be’).

Morphological passives in Austronesian languages of Indonesia are typically found in the Indonesian-type of languages dominating the western part of Indonesia. Examples (33)–(39) show the Indonesian languages that have passive morphology (Indonesian, Balinese, Makasarese, Javanese, Menô-Menê Sasak, and Bima). Some of them may have more than one passive affix. Indonesian di- and –ter (33) and Javanese di- and ke- (36) differ in volitionality of the event, e.g. ter-ike- implying an accidental event. Balinese ka- and –a (34) differ in register, with ka- being used in high register (see Arka 1998; to appear, for further details). Di- and ra- in Bima (39) differ in mood (realis vs irrealis).

22 By this, he means, ‘non-agentive’ (i.e. ‘the opposite of active, actional’). All state verbs are ‘stative’; hence they are typically ‘inactive’. However, inactive verbs may express ‘dynamic’ situations. For example, Maria was kissed by Juan is as dynamic as the corresponding active. Inactive verbs are typically intransitive but they can be transitive (e.g. ‘undergo’ and ‘suffer’).
(33) a. Anak itu di-gigit (oleh anjing)  
child that PASS-bite by dog  
‘The child was bitten by a dog’

b. Mereka ter-tabrak ((oleh) mobil)  
3p PASS-hit by car  
‘They (accidentally) got hit by a car’

(34) a. Ipun ka-icen jinah antuk Bapak Guru  
3 PASS-give money by father teacher  
‘(S)he was given money by the teacher’

b. Nyoman beli-ang-a nasi teken I Meme  
NAME buy-APPL-PASS rice by ART mother  
‘Rice was bought for Nyoman by Mother’

(35) Ni-jakkalak-i ri pulisi  
PASS-arrest-3 by police (Manyambeang, Mulya, and Nasruddin 1996)  
‘He was arrested by the police’

(36) a. Klambi-ne di-kumbah aku/kowe/Siti  
shirt-DEF PASS-wash 1s/2s/Name (Sawardi 2001)  
‘The shirt was washed by me/you/Siti’

b. Klambi-ne ke-kumbah aku/kowe/Siti  
shirt-DEF PASS-wash 1s/2s/Name  
‘The shirt was accidentally washed by me/you/Siti’

(37) Aku te-gitaq isiq Ali  
1s PASS-see by NAME (Austin 2002)  
‘I was seen by Ali’

(38) ‘U-to-kiki’i na iko’o  
2s.R-PASS-bit NOM you (Donohue 2002)  
‘You were bitten’

(39) a. Sia ra-ha’a ba ngao ede  
3s PASS.REAL-bit by cat that (Jauhary 2000)  
‘(S)he has been bitten by the cat.’

b. Wela ede di-weli ba La Amir  
kite that PASS.IRR-buy by ART NAME  
‘The kite will be bought by Amir’

While some AN languages outside Flores show morphological passives, other AN languages in Flores do not even have passives. Although we talk about ‘passive’ in Manggarai, Manggarai does not have a typical passive because the head verb bears no verbal morphology.
We have provided evidence for the analysis that the construction with the (backgrounded) *le* agent is passive even though the verb form of this construction morphologically has the same form as the active counterpart. Indeed, the *le* Agent construction in Manggarai also passes Haspelmath’s passive criteria formulated in (32). The first criterion—optionality of an Oblique—is satisfied because the *le* agent is indeed omissible in certain limited contexts, see discussion in 4.2., example (28) and (29). The second criterion—the passive Subject corresponds to the active Object—is also satisfied. The Patient of the *le* (passive) construction is indeed grammatically Subject. The evidence comes from a number of tests (agreement, structural positions, reflexive binding and control) discussed in 4.1. As for the third criterion—markedness and functionality—we can say for certain that the passive is pragmatically marked (i.e. functionally specialised). The distribution of the passive in texts is slightly less frequent than the corresponding active construction in a small sample of texts that we have looked at. As seen in Table 3, the use of active and passive constructions vary across texts (intransitive verbs such as ‘come’ and ‘sit’ are excluded). Out of a total of 94 transitive verbs, around two third of them (62 verbs, or 66%) appear in active constructions whereas 26 are in passives with agents and only 6 in agentless passives.

Table 3. The frequency of actives and passives in some Manggarai texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text titles</th>
<th>Actives</th>
<th>Passives with agents</th>
<th>Passives without agents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Wendong ata manusia <em>le</em> darat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tombo tora mangan rana mese</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sungke cahap</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tombo Ka agu Kode</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Passives with obligatory agents are reported to exist (Siewierska 1984:35). Indonesian is said to have this kind of passive based on the analysis of Chung (1976). This is the Indonesian non-agentive construction with pronominal clitic on the verb, e.g. *buku itu ku=baca* ‘book that 1s=read’. However, current research (Arka and Manning 1998, to appear) suggests that this type of structure is not really syntactically passive because the verb is syntactically transitive with the Agent clitic *ku=* being a core argument (i.e. not an Oblique). Note that the situation in Manggarai is different in at least two respects. First, the *le* Agent is generally obligatory but is optional in certain circumstances. The Indonesian *ku=* is always obligatory. And second, this is crucial, there is evidence that the *le* Agent, unlike Indonesian *ku=*, is not core.

24 It should be noted that text 4 Sungke Cahap appears to show a slightly greater number of passives (16) to actives (12). A closer look at this story, however, reveals that it is about a variety of social and physical problems suffered by a person who has a bad habit of talking while sleeping. The focus of the story is ‘Patient-oriented’; i.e. how this person undergoes a variety of bad experiences with other people. The high proportion of passive verbs is expected. We believe that the genre has a distinct effect on the type of structures used as text 4 shows, which may be inconsistent with the generalisation that actives are more common than passives across text types.
There is evidence from Austronesian languages of Indonesia to support Haspelmath’s observation that an inactive verb may get grammaticalised (and morphologised) to become a passive marker. For example, the ‘informal’ Indonesian passive *ke-* clearly originates from the verb *kena* be adversely hit by, suffer’. Both of them (i.e. sentences (40a) and (40b) are used interchangeably nowadays. In standard/formal Indonesian, *di-* passive (40c) is used, however.

(40) a. *Ia* *kena* tipu  
3s hit cheat  
(S)he was/got cheated’

b. *Ia* *ke-tipu*  
3s PASS-cheat  
(S)he was/got cheated’

c. *Ia* *di-tipu*  
3s PASS-cheat  
(S)he was/got cheated’

It is not clear at this stage whether Balinese passive *ka-* (high register, possibly borrowed from (Old) Javanese (Clynes 1989), illustrated in (41)) also came from an inactive verb. Balinese *ka-* unlike the informal Indonesian *ke-* or Javanese *ke-* has no accidental or adversative meaning.

(41) Gumi-ne *ka-prentah* (*antuk/teken bangsa gelah*)  
country-DEF PASS-govern by people own  
‘The country is governed (by our own people)’

The historical origin of the Manggarai passive marker *le* is unclear at this stage. Particularly, we do not know for sure whether *le* used to be a verb. Most likely, it was never a verb. The apparently related (cognate?) words in other western Austronesian languages are all prepositions (e.g. Indonesian *oleh*, Balinese *olih* and Acehnese *lé*). In contemporary Manggarai, *le* is a preposition. Indeed, Verheijen’s dictionary (Verheijen 1967) lists it only as a preposition. No other entries of the same form are listed as verbs of the ‘inactive’ type meaning ‘suffer’ and the like. (Recall that Haspelmath (1990) claims that the common historical path of the passive marker is from an inactive verb.)

If Manggarai *le* was never a verb, then Manggarai is indeed a language that has a passive without passive morphology, contrary to Haspelmath’s generalisation, because *le* is not a unique marker of the passive construction. As noted earlier in (4.2), preposition *le* is also used to encode locative, goal, and instrument. It is worth discussing other languages that have been cited to have a Passive without passive morphology (which potentially challenge Haspelamath’s claim). In what follows, we briefly discuss Chinese and Acehnese cases.

Like Manggarai, Chinese is an isolating language. Like Manggarai, it employs the same verb form (i.e. without any additional affix) in both active and passive constructions. For example, the

---

25 Apparently, this ‘informal passive’ in Indonesian is related to Javanese *ke-*. It is unclear, however, whether the Javanese *ke-* also came from an inactive verb ‘suffer or hit’.

26 The historical origin of passive prefix *di-* is a matter of debate. There are at least three competing hypothesises. It could come from (i) a captured (locative) preposition *di-*, or (ii) a third person pronoun *dia*, or (iii) the PAST affix *ni-* (see Ross (Ross to appear) for detailed discussion).
verb form zhemo appears in the active sentence (42a) as well as in the passive counterpart (42b). The passive construction is marked by (what is believed now to be) the preposition bei. Bei may appear without its Agent complement NP as shown by example (42c).

(42) a. Zhou Hua zhemo Gao Qiang (Shi 1997)
NAME torment NAME
‘Zhou Hua tormented Gao Qiang’

b. Gao Qiang bei Zhou Hua zhemo
NAME BEI NAME torment
‘Gao Qiang was tormented by Zhou Hua’

c. Wo bei liyongle
I BEI use.ASP
‘I was used’

Haspelmath (1990) argues that the Chinese bei passive is not against his claim because there is (historical) evidence, discussed in (Bennett 1981; Hashimoto 1988; Zhang 1990), that bei was not a proposition, but a verb. In Old Chinese, it was a verb meaning ‘to receive’ (Bennett 1981), ‘to sustain’ (Hashimoto 1988) or ‘to cover’ (which later changed to ‘suffer’) (Zhang 1990). The double functions of bei (as a preposition and a verb-like/passive marker) have led to competing analyses of the exact status of this morpheme as reviewed in Shi (1997). In short, the data that seems to be against Hispelmath’s claim turns out, from a historical perspective, to support his analysis that a passive marker originates from an ‘inactive’ verb.

Turning to the Acehnese case, we have a different situation. Consider examples (43) which show that the verb form geu-Êm ‘3p-kiss’ in the alleged passive sentence (43b) also employs the same verb form as the active (43a). Sentence (43b) is claimed to be passive by Lawler (1977) but is refuted by Durie (1988). Durie (1988) argues that the so-called passive in Acehnese illustrated by (43b) is in fact not passive, rather a word order variant of the active structure (43a) (i.e. sentence (43b) is a kind of Patient preposing). The controversy of the analysis boils down to the idea whether the notion of ‘Subject’ (on which the notion of ‘Passive’ is based) can be proved to be relevant in Acehnese. In particular, the validity of the passive analysis of sentence (43b) very much depends on the evidence that the sentence initial NP (in this case lôn) is grammatically ‘Subject’. Durie (1988) argues that it is not. In fact, Durie (1987) argues that no surface grammatical relations of Subject and Object can be identified in Acehnese. Lawler (1988) (in his reply to Durie (1988)) points out that such notions as ‘Subject’ (and also ‘Passive’) are appropriate for Acehnese, at least in a more recent grammar of Acehnese by Asyik (1987), a native speaker of the language.

27 Evidence that it is not an ordinary preposition comes from the fact that it does not behave like a preposition in modern Chinese; e.g. bei can be left stranded as in (42c) whereas a real preposition cannot (Hashimoto 1988; Shi 1997:46)

28 The subscript ‘p’ means ‘polite’ and IN means ‘INCHOATIVE’.

29 However, one could embrace a framework or analysis that does not make use of Subject and Object metalanguage but can still talk about passives (e.g. Foley and Valin 1984; Shibatani 1985).

30 We have not been able to consult this work.
(43) a.  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Gopnyan} & \text{ka} & \text{geu-côm} & \text{lôn} \\
\text{she}_p & \text{IN} & 3\text{-kiss} & 1_p \\
\end{array}
\]
‘She kissed me’

b.  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Lôn} & \text{ka} & \text{geu-côm} & \text{lê-gopnyan} \\
1_p & \text{IN} & 3\text{-kiss} & -\text{she}_p \\
\end{array}
\]
‘I was kissed by her’

It should be noted that Acehnese, unlike Manggarai and Chinese, is not strictly speaking an isolating language. Acehnese crucially differs from the two languages in having an agreement system marked on the verb that is sensitive to the verbal semantics or argument-roles of the verb. For example, bound pronoun geu- in (43) agrees with the Agent argument; hence it agrees with Gopnyan, irrespective of whether the free NP Agent appears before the verb as in the active sentence (43a) or after the verb as in the alleged passive structure (43b), where the free NP agent must be marked by a preposition-like marker lê- (This marker is not glossed in (43b) and poses a potential problem in Durie’s analysis). The agreement is particularly clear in the case of intransitive verbs where a split is recognised: an action-like intransitive verb such as ‘run’ gets agreement like the transitive Agent whereas a Patient-like intransitive verb like ‘fall’ does not get this agreement (see Durie 1987 for details).

Recall that Manggarai also shows (en)clitic agreement. However, the enclitic agreement in Manggarai significantly differs from the agreement in Acehnese in that Manggarai clitic agreement is indeed sensitive to surface grammatical relations: it is associated with Subject, which is therefore not restricted to the Agent role. This has been discussed in subsections (4.1 and 4.2) to prove that there is passivisation in Manggarai (i.e. Object-Subject alternation of the Patient of the transitive verb).

Another difference between Manggarai and Acehnese relates to the grammatical status of the Agent argument of the semantically transitive verb. We have argued at length that the Agent marked by le in Manggarai is Oblique. This is not easily resolved in Acehnese due to the presence of the pronominal geu- on the verb. A bound pronoun that precedes a verb (or occurs morphologically on the verb) and receives cross-reference with a floating PP (typically after the verb) is in fact not unique to Acehnese. Balinese and Sasak are other such languages. This type of structure indeed poses a problem in the analysis of, for example, Balinese voice. However, current research on Balinese (particularly with evidence from binding and other properties as discussed in (Arka 1998, to appear)) has led to progress in the understanding of such a structure. For this reason, we briefly discuss the Balinese examples and then turn to Sasak.

In Balinese, there is evidence for grammaticalisation of the bound pronoun to become a passive marker. Consider examples (44) where the third person bound pronoun –a can be made explicit by a following PP teken Wayan as in (44c). In contemporary Balinese, this is unambiguously a syntactic passive, as argued in (Arka 1998, to appear). However, the PP Agent in Balinese, like the

---

31 It is intriguing to note that the marker of the Agent in Manggarai and Achenese is both lê. (Our notation for Manggarai le is pronounced as lê.) This preposition may be the cognate form of Indonesian/Malay preposition olêh or Balinese preposition olih, which also mark Agents of passives in these languages. Note that li or ali may be also used in some dialects of Manggarai. Further research is certainly needed to uncover how widespread is the prepositional marking in the Austronesian languages of Indonesia with the cognate of le.

32 He analyses it as an ‘ergative’ marker, which seems to add more controversy rather than clarification to the Achehnese analysis.
one in Acehnese, can be absent as in (44b). This is an ambiguous structure. On one hand, the (bound) pronoun $=a$ can be understood as an argument of the verb, in which case the verb is associated with Objective Voice (OV). This kind of voice, typical in western Austronesian voice systems, reflects an Undergoer-oriented voice (where the Patient is Subject) but, unlike Passive voice, the Agent is still a core argument. On the other hand, it may be simply a variant of passive (44c) with the Agent being unexpressed. Arka (1998; to appear) argues that in the presence of the PP Agent (i.e. of the type (44c), the construction is indeed syntactically passive because the evidence overwhelmingly shows that the Agent is an Oblique. In short, in contemporary Balinese, the bound pronoun lives a double-life (as a bound pronoun and as a ‘passive’ marker). The evidence for the analysis of different voices in Balinese is much clearer than that in Acehnese thanks to the verbal voice morphology in Balinese, particularly the marking of the Active Voice (AV) by a nasal prefix. That is, we are absolutely sure that the Patient argument in (44b) is grammatically Subject. A similar claim with absolute certainty apparently cannot be made for the Acehnese data in (43b).

(44) a. Wayan maang Nyoman pipis
   NAME AV.give NAME money
   ‘Wayan gave Nyoman money’

b. Nyoman baang=$a$ pipis
   NAME OV.give=3 money
   ‘(S)he gave NYOMAN (not someone else) money’

c. Nyoman baang-$a$ pipis (teken Wayan)
   NAME give-PASS money by Wayan
   ‘Nyoman was given money (by Wayan)’

A similar example from Menó-Mené Sasak is given in (45) (Austin 2002), where bound clitic $=n$ is cross referenced by PP isiq Herman. While Austin explicitly claims that this type of sentence is transitive (not passive), he is not explicit in saying whether it is ‘active’ or ‘agentive’ voice. (Note that the Balinese OV verb illustrated in (44b) is also syntactically transitive but it is not ‘agentive/actor-oriented’.) This is presumably because Menó-Mené Sasak does not distinguish grammatical relations other than core versus oblique (Austin 2002, f.n. 6). In this case, then the PP Agent construction in Menó-Mené Sasak is closer to that in Achenese than that in Balinese. Unlike Acehnese, however, Menó-Mené Sasak clearly has a passive construction with verbal passive morphology (te-, example (37) repeated here as (45b)). Note that the same preposition (isiq) is used to marked the Agent NP.

(45) a. Yaq=$n$ gitaq kanak-kanak=$no$ isiq Herman (Austin 2002)
   fut=3 see child-child=tjat by NAME
   ‘Herman will see the children’

b. Aku te-gitaq isiq Ali
   1s PASS-see by NAME
   ‘I was seen by Ali’

The points that we want to highlight with the data from other (Austronesian) languages of Indonesia are these. First, the idea of passive without passive morphology in other languages such as Acehnese, for example, might be hard to prove because the presence of the bound pronominal
Agent clitic or prefix on the verb may indicate that the verb is still transitive (i.e. no change in transitivity as is the case if we have passivisation). Other processes in Acehnese such as reflexive binding appear to be sensitive to semantic role hierarchy (Durie 1987); hence they do not help much. In contrast, the situation in Manggarai is much clearer because there are language-specific properties such as agreement clitic and reflexive binding that help us to show that the grammatical relation of the bare Agent NP is different from that of the PP (le) Agent. Secondly, an apparently similar (pronominal) bound form that might be encountered in other constructions might have been grammaticalised to become a different voice marker. In other words, on the basis of the same morphology (e.g. Balinese bound form –a), we cannot jump to the conclusion that the form (and the verb/construction) is associated with a single voice. It may be ambiguous between two different voices, Objective Voice (OV) and Passive voice. In Manggarai, we do not have this ambiguity; we can now claim for sure that we have a clear distinction between active and passive constructions.

Finally, the significance of the preposition-like marker of passive needs a brief comment here. While in Indonesian and Balinese, the preposition that marks the Oblique Agent is not considered a marker of passive because the verb has got passive morphology, le in Manggarai is the only indication by which passive is recognised. It is therefore a very important marker. In isolating languages, due to the lack of passive morphology on the verb, any marker (outside the verb) that indicates a passive understandably serves a significant cue. This is confirmed by research from language processing (in other languages of a similar type). For example, Li, Bates, and MacWhinney (1993) reports that, while there is evidence for the significance of animacy in Chinese speakers’ use of different cues in sentence processing, bei is a powerful cue, helping the speakers select the second noun more than any other cue. Indeed, even if the prepositional marker for Oblique is not generally considered a passive marker (e.g. in languages like English), it turns out to be a crucial cue. A report on language comprehension and production of the passive voice among ten severely prelingually deaf boys and girls (Power and Quigley 1973) indicates that more than half of them correctly understood passive sentences and less than half correctly produce such sentences. Crucially, they interpret passive sentences in terms of the surface word order and the proposition by was the only passive marker for most of deaf children. It appears that much emphasis has been given on the use verbal morphology to identify the (so-called) Passive in the linguistic literature on voice but verbal voice morphology might not be as significant or powerful a marker as we initially thought.

6. Conclusion

Manggarai is an instance of the language that has a passive construction without passive verbal morphology. This passive construction appears with le, marking the Oblique status of the Agent argument of the (semantically transitive) verb. We have presented evidence to support the analysis that the le Agent construction passes typical passive properties. However, since le is not unique to the passive (i.e. it is also used to mark locatives, instrumental, and goals), it cannot be claimed that it is the passive marker in Manggarai. It is simply a marker of non-core status, which is also used in other construction types.

Typologically speaking, it is not really surprising to have a passive without passive morphology. If one looks at how passives get expressed cross-linguistically, as Haspelmath points out, they are of numerous types (morphological, analytical, or a combination of these) with the voice
morphology, if any, not originally used to mark passives. An earlier study by Andersen (1989) also reveals the same conclusion and he further concludes that ‘the existence of passive morphology is neither necessary nor sufficient for the definition of the passive.’ In other words, passive morphology is not central to the characterisation of the passive construction.

The question then is what characterises passives cross-linguistically. Siewierska (1984:39-40) list a number of properties that distinguish passives from actives (the order of NPs, special verbal morphology, etc.) but further suggests that none of them can be used for defining passives in all passive constructions. One way of characterizing passives cross-linguistically is to abstract away from overt or surface expressions by referring to certain (abstract) relations such as ‘Subject’ and ‘Object’, which is in fact a practice that has been a long tradition in linguistics. Such abstract relations are taken up again in contemporary syntactic theories, notably Relational Grammar (Perlmutter and Postal 1977) and Lexical Functional Grammar (e.g. (Bresnan 1982)). An attempt to formulate the universal characterisation within Relational Grammar is given in (Perlmutter and Postal 1977), which is refuted in (O’Grady 1980) but is defended in (Dryer 1982). (Note that the characterisation of passives from Haspelmath cited in (32) makes use the notions of ‘subject’ and ‘object’ as well.) The advantage of using abstract relations such as subject and object is that it allows us to draw generalisations without saying anything about passive morphology (or other overt markings).

However, a morphological characterisation of passives seems to be assumed in at least two current theories. This seems to be a drawback because it leads to a problem. In LFG (Alsina and Mchombo 1990; Alsina and Mchombo 1993; Bresnan 2001; Bresnan and Kanerva 1989; Dalrymple 2001, among others), passive alternations are dealt with under alternative linking within LMT (Lexical Mapping Theory), in which certain morphology on the verb (i.e. a passive affix) signifies a marked linking where the Agent is either totally suppressed from the argument structure of the verb or prevented from being mapped onto Subject. The passive in Manggarai would pose a problem to this conception of passivisation as a morpholexical process. In this view, passivisation necessarily involves morphological derivation (or affixation). However, as we have seen, passivisation in Manggarai involves no such derivation. Likewise, it is arguably hard to deal with the Manggarai passive in the Case-theoretic Chomskyan transformational model of grammar (see for example, Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis 1992; Webelhuth 1995), where passivisation is also associated with morphological verbal marking because the basic assumption of this model is that passivisation involves movement of an NP (i.e. the Patient) motivated by Case (absorption). It is assumed that the passive affix is said to ‘absorb’ Case that would be otherwise assigned to the Patient by the transitive verb. As result, the Patient has to move to a position where it may receive Case (i.e. to the Subject position). Again, we cannot appeal to such a Case-theoretic explanation to account for the passive in Manggarai because there is no affix on the verb that can absorb Case in

33 Another way of doing it is to analyse different kinds of voice in terms of prototypes, in which pragmatic, semantic, syntactic and morphological properties are considered (see Shibatani (1985) for details.)

34 As noted in (Siewierska 1984), when we speak of a universal characterization of passive we do not mean that the passive is a universal phenomenon, because it is obvious that many languages lack this voice category. For example, Austronesian languages of eastern Indonesia (e.g. Taba (Bowden 2001)) typically show no passives. Based on the Gramcats sample, Haspelmath (1990) remarks that ‘it is more likely for a language to lack a passive than to have one’.

35 Analysing passives within a version of LFG e.g. (Andrews and Manning 1999) , where passives can be viewed as complex predicates might solve the problem. We leave this for further research.
Discussing the theoretical issues of Manggarai passive in detail is certainly beyond the scope of the present paper.
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The idea of NP movement within this Case-theoretic passive analysis may have problems from a typological perspective with respect to cases: i) where passivisation does not appear to affect the grammatical role of the patient nominals (e.g. the passive in Mayan languages) (Shibatani 1985; 1988:2-3), or ii) where passives do not seem to have active counterparts as in Indonesian (examples below, pointed to me by Yassir N. Tjung, p.c.) and in Nootka-Nitinait (Rose and Carlson 1984).

(i) *Uang-nya di-beli-kan mobil oleh Amir* (passive)
    money-DEF PASS-buy-APPL car by NAME
    ‘The money was used to buy a car by Amir’

(ii) *Amir membeli-kan uang-nya mobil*
    NAME AV.buy-APPL money-DEF car
    ‘Amir bought the car with the money’

In a lexically-based model such as LFG (within the linking theory) (Alsina and Mchombo 1990; Alsina and Mchombo 1993; Bresnan 2001; Bresnan and Kanerva 1989; Dalrymple 2001, among others), the two problems just mentioned can be easily dealt with because active and passive verbs may share arguments structures but crucially there is no requirement that the Patient that is linked to Subject (in the passive verb) must be always linked to Object first. That is, there is no one-to-one relation between active and passive constructions. Arguments for the idea that passivisation is a lexically-based relational change (not a syntactic transformational process) is discussed, among others, in (Bresnan 1978, 2001).


